11 A German "Illusive Love"

Rashīd Riḍā's Perceptions of the First World War in the Muslim World

Umar Ryad

> The inevitable event comes to pass … as enticed by the vanity of the Great States. It was thought that their politicians due to their shrewdness were able to hold down the fire in the stove so that its evil will not extend to its neighboring places. Europe that is filled with gunpowder and dynamite thought to secure itself from the flame against which Bismarck had already warned … forgetting God's general justice in all nations and peoples.[1]

This is what Shaykh Muḥammad Rashīd Ridā (1865–1935) wrote in early August 1914, a few days after the Great War broke out in Europe. Linking its anticipated calamities for humanity with the Koranic description of the Day of Resurrection, he perceived the war as *al-ṭāmma al-ṣughrā* (the Minor Disaster) putting it on a scale with *al-ṭāmma al-kubrā* (the Great Disaster), which is a Koranic allusion to the Last (Judgment) Day.

Riḍā is no doubt one of the most intriguing figures in modern Islamic history. As an heir to the *Salafiyya* reformist movement of his time, his religious and political views and activism are crystallized in his well-known journal *al-Manār* (The Lighthouse, 1898–1935) published in Cairo. Before World War I, Riḍā became involved in open and secret political societies that aimed at the struggle against colonial interventions in the Muslim World. World War I and its aftermath created a global moment which influenced many world events and actions. During the war, Riḍā not only continued his pre-war activities, but became involved in other attempts to further the cause of Arab independence which the war had triggered. Riḍā aspired to set up an Anglo-Arab alliance that could guarantee Arab independence and save both the temporal and spiritual authority of Islam.[2] In his search for alternative outlooks for the imperial world order through his political activities, Riḍā formulated specific views of the war and the political, military and religious consequences of the German-Ottoman alliance in it as a "European war". His views are remarkable examples of how Muslim reformists of that age perceived

World War I as a great event in global history. We argue that the war had many paradoxical influences on Riḍā's anti-westernist tone and political choices.

As the power of the Ottoman empire was vanishing from the politics of world order, Jihad, pan-Islam, pan-Arabism and the Caliphate became ideologized terms during the war years. Muslim intellectuals and activists took their political courses of action according to their preference for one ideology over another as a remedy for the Muslim political malaise; and Riḍā was no exception. He had an "idealized" hope of establishing a sense of belonging and nationalism among his Muslim and Arab compatriots. Many of his generation tried to create their own alternative politico-cultural options. Riḍā aimed at establishing a political and religious unity among Muslims to the extent that he was sometimes obliged to call for British-Arab friendship and an Arab-Zionist entente. In that sense, Europe's proclaimed centrality in the world political order moulded Riḍā's perceptions of Europe itself in his quest for an imagined Islamic and Arab unity. As we shall see, his growing pessimism and frustration emanated from his perception of an unbalanced world order and the unfair rules of the international political game and rivalries. These troubled relations in the *Weltpolitik* had their implications for the scope and shape of his pan-Islamic nationalist visions even after the war. Riḍā's attitudes reflect the fact that Islamic nationalism, and pan-Islamism in general, was an ambivalent project containing reactionary and changeable components in a greater world of politics and pragmatism.[3]

Early German-Ottoman Alliance

As a religious concept, Jihad became a political instrument to mobilize public opinion in favour of the political cause of the Sublime Porte. In different political and military contexts in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Ottomans exploited the term as a rallying cry seeking support for their national and international policies. Nevertheless, it was the discourse of the Great War that vigorously revitalized its validity on both the Ottoman and German sides. The jihadization of the Ottoman participation on the German side was certainly the product of a Ottoman-German joint project. Whether it was a "holy war made in Germany" or not, Jihad was a significant node in politics throughout the war years.[4]

Besides such religious justifications, many pan-Islamists, nationalists, intellectuals and religious scholars among Riḍā's contemporaries perceived Germany as the only European Power that had befriended

Islam without having obvious interests in Muslim territories.[5] Despite the global character of this Jihad propaganda in the Muslim world, not all Muslim religious scholars had accepted the religious justification for that war. This holds true for Riḍā, who was an influential spokesman for the Arab and Muslim nationalism of his age. He did not champion the idea of joining the German side, nor did he show any sympathy for the leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP). Ironically, as a pan-Arabist seeking "Arab religious nationalism"[6] during the war Riḍā was not involved in this Jihad debate. Unlike other fellow Muslim ideologues who were drawn into the Ottoman-German propaganda coalition, Riḍā was not a proponent of the Ottoman participation in what he saw as a "European war." As Riḍā was an influential pan-Islamic defender of the Caliphate at a later stage, in the early 1920s, a re-reading to his writings in *al-Manār* from the war years therefore adds other aspects to the Muslim religious and political discourse regarding the Ottoman decision to enter the Great War on the German side. His lack of interest in a German coalition and support for Anglo-Arab cooperation could also be understood against his background as belonging to the Syrian community in Egypt that did not share the political views of the local population because of their pro-British stance. Anti-British and pro-Ottoman Egyptian nationalists even depicted the Syrians, including Riḍā, as *dukhalā* (intruders) and collaborators with the British in Egypt. The Syrians were much more interested in the Syrian cause than in the Egyptian nationalist question.[7]

From the start, Riḍā was cautious about giving full support to the German-Ottoman alliance. His views were nevertheless inconsistent, as he constantly tried many political strategies before and during the war to achieve what he saw as his goal of Arab unity. In his early career, he considered the Ottomans to be "the representatives of that Islamic temporal independent power."[8] In reaction to Kaiser Wilhelm's declaration of himself as a protector of all Muslims during his well-known visit to the Ottoman empire in 1898, Riḍā did not object to the Sublime Porte's alliance with any European power, but he stressed that one should not forget that the whole of Europe was "an enemy" for Muslims. However, since Germany had no "greedy ambition" in the Ottoman empire the Germans were better allies than all the other European nations.[9] Riḍā also received with great enthusiasm the Kaiser's visit to Saladin's tomb in Damascus when he laid a wreath and hung a lamp of "solid silver" on the tomb.[10] At this point, Riḍā moreover saw the German emperor as the "leader of the best-organized army" whose admiration for Saladin emanated from his acknowledgment of the latter as "the greatest warrior" of Islam.[11]

Before the war, Riḍā's early political responses to the German interests in the Ottoman empire changed over the course of time. Despite his early positive attitude towards the Ottoman-German alliance, Riḍā was always frustrated about all kinds of colonialism in the Muslim world. As early as 1904, he became convinced that Germany wanted to disturb the balance of power in Europe by its alliance with the Russians during the Russo-Japanese war. Riḍā expected that the supremacy in the world would be divided between the Anglo-Saxons and Germans in the end.[12] However, despite its knowledge and civilization, Germany followed a policy of "selfishness" in its colony in East Africa. By exhibiting such behaviour, Germany would gradually lose its status among Muslims, who would ultimately give their preference to British rule above that of other European nations.[13]

Arabism versus Ottomanism

Riḍā's understanding of the Great War should be seen in conjunction with his fluctuating political positions in the pre-war period and during the war. In the beginning he was an advocate of the integrity of the Ottoman state and its ability to resist imperialism. For the Caliphate, the Arabs were more significant for the religious sphere of the empire, while the Turks were much needed for its supremacy in the field of political and military power. For him "the Arab is the germ (*jurthūma*) of Islam while the Turk is its piercing sword."[14] Therefore, in that period he worked for strong Turkish-Arab relations which might bring prosperity to the empire. To realize his Arab nationalist ideas, he was ready to back the Young Turks in their demands for democratic rule and an anti-corruption programme, but he was anxious about their possible adoption of a western-style nationalist type that would maximize their sense of nationalism for the supremacy of the Turkish race above other ethnicities in the Empire. Therefore, his position was divided between his hope for democracy brought about by the Young Turks and the necessity of resisting their Turkish nationalism which he saw as the task of the Caliph.[15]

After the deposing of Sultan Abdulhamid, Riḍā sided with the CUP. In 1909, he travelled to Istanbul to seek financial support for the establishment of his future school for training Muslim missionaries, *Dār al-Daʿwā wa al-Irshād* (House of Preaching and Guidance). Although he was much interested in Turkish-Arab reconciliation, he regularly warned against a racial type of Turkish nationalism.[16] His school plan was initially accepted on the condition that its language should be Turkish and its

supervision and finance should be under Shaykh al-Islam's budget. Riḍā objected and after a few months he became frustrated as he had begun to feel that the CUP government wanted to use his school as a tool for their Turkification policies. Embittered he went to the British Embassy in Istanbul and declared the CUP to be a group of atheists and freemasons who exploited Islam for their political ends.[17]

In 1911 Riḍā established the "Society of Arab Association" in Cairo with the aim of achieving unity among the Arab rulers of the Arabian Peninsula and cooperation with Arab societies in Syria, Iraq and Istanbul against the CUP. He sent emissaries to most of these Arab rulers in the Arabian Peninsula in an attempt to convince them of the necessity of establishing a pan-Arab empire covering Syria, Iraq and the Arabian Peninsula.[18] Riḍā lost this hope for unity due to the CUP's Turkification policy in the empire and the violation of Arab rights. Since Islam and Arabism were almost synonymous in his view, any attempt to weaken Arabism was therefore an assault against Islam itself.[19]

A German "Illusive" Love

While his attack on the CUP government was reaching its peak, Riḍā became very outspoken in his reservations about the Ottoman-German alliance. More than a decade after the Kaiser's visit to the Sublime Porte, Riḍā profoundly reconsidered his position regarding the reality and meaning of this perceived German friendship with the empire. The Porte was not supposed to get any benefit from Germany, except in training and organizing the Ottoman army. For him, it was actually the leaders of the CUP that were harming Muslims because of their "arrogant" policies.[20] The appearance of Germany on the political scene after the Kaiser's visit to Istanbul had increased British agitation and prompted the creation of a new Russian-British coalition against the Sublime Porte. Almost three years before World War I, due to the change in European policies in the East, Riḍā now completely changed his earlier views regarding the German-Ottoman rapprochement by saying:

> It was of the worst luck for the Muslim world – East or West –, when it was deceived by the German Kaiser in this new political stage. Istanbul, Tehran and Fes [Morocco] were misled by his showing of inclination and love to the Islamic world and his wish to maintain its [Muslim] states independent, cherished and powerful.[21]

In Riḍā's opinion, the German "illusive" love did not benefit the Islamic world and "the voice of the Kaiser in greeting … the millions of Muslims had been foreboding and the beginning of misery."[22]

As World War I was approaching, Riḍā became suspicious about the effect of the international diplomatic conferences of his time, since secret agreements between colonial states always interfered with the outcome of their resolutions.[23] By then, he was lamenting that Germany had misused the concept of Ottomanism through the leaders of the CUP in order to achieve its own political interests. An example of that was the German intervention in the issue of the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria and its facilitating German Zionist Jews to occupy the Holy Land in Palestine.[24] Riḍā launched a severe attack against the CUP leaders by depicting them as "enemies of Arabs and Islam." Because of their Turcification policy and what he saw as support for Zionists, Riḍā attacked them for their "lack of Islamic feeling," as contrasted with what he saw as Bismarck's deep religiosity. Religion was significant in any military confrontation, as any combat troops believing in God and the Hereafter would have much more resolution and endurance in wartime. In that sense, German leaders built their unity on the "rock of faith," while the Ottoman CUP leaders built their union on the "sand of atheism."[25]

At this juncture, Riḍā lost his faith in the Ottoman empire. He saw the Great War as a suitable opportunity for the Arabs to launch a revolt against the Ottomans and liberate their countries from the empire's repression. Therefore, his political opportunism did not inhibit him from approaching the British Intelligence Department in Cairo, also responsible for the propaganda section of the Arab Bureau,[26] trying to convince them of the influence which the Arab Association could exercise on the Arab officers in the Ottoman army and their willingness to rebel against their Ottoman and German commanders. However, as will become clear later, Riḍā also held reserved attitudes towards the British authorities because of their ambitions in Arab regions.[27]

By the end of 1912 Riḍā was organizing the Ottoman Administrative Decentralization Party (*Ḥizb al-lā markaziyya al-idāriyya al-ʿuthmānī*) with other pan-Arabists in Cairo; and was elected as its president.

Before the war, the German Consulate reported to Berlin about the activities of Syrian exiles in Cairo led by Riḍā. It is reported that he met the German emissary in Cairo and discussed the dream of establishing an independent Arab caliphate under the Khedive of Egypt ruling Syria and Arabia. Riḍā asked for German diplomatic support in acquiring armaments against the Anglo-French – a request which was quickly refused.[28] Probably after this failure with the Germans, Riḍā started to develop a feeling of antipathy towards what he saw as German colonial

ambitions in the Muslim world for two reasons, namely due to their great interest in the Berlin-Baghdad Express (or Baghdad Railway) and German solidarity with the Young Turks. With this, Germany was eager to increase its economic interests in Palestine and to strengthen its colonial schemes in the Ottoman empire without "shedding a drop of German blood."[29] If Germany continued to consolidate its supremacy in the same manner in the coming years, Riḍā anticipated, British military power would never be able to "stop the stream of German greed."[30]

Meanwhile, Riḍā also became concerned about the Arab provinces in the Ottoman empire falling into the hands of imperialist European powers. This fear strongly increased after the Ottoman defeat by the Italians in Libya and in the Balkan War. In 1912 he travelled to India on a lecture tour; and on his way back to Egypt he passed through Kuwait and Masqat in order to persuade Arab leaders of the necessity to establish an independent Arab state.[31] In a pamphlet he warned the Arabs against the intention of western foreigners to gain control over Syria and the Arabian Peninsula as a first stage in their plan "to destroy the Kaʿba and transport the Black Stone and the ashes of the Prophet to the Louvre."[32]

Riḍā hoped that the Ottoman defeat in the Balkan War would shake the CUP leaders in Istanbul. For him, Ottoman political rulers were only concerned with strengthening the power of European states in the Ottoman empire, while unwisely ignoring the potential opportunities to cooperate with the Arabs. In order to solve this problem, he proposed changing Istanbul into a purely military base, and moving the capital of the empire to the Arab city of Damascus or to the Anatolian city of Konya.[33]

Despite Riḍā's generally explicit anti-Zionist stance, he later became an advocate of an Arab-Zionist entente before the war. He saw no problem in the fact that Syrians would draw on Jewish capital in order to develop projects in their country, since the Jews, he asserted, controlled European finance.[34] In 1913, an Egyptian Zionist reported to the Zionist Head Office in Berlin that some representatives of the Decentralization Party, Riḍā's secret society, wanted to conclude an agreement "with us." This meeting was supposed to take place during the visit of these decentralizationists to the First Arab Congress in Paris in 1913. Despite his short-term support for a Zionist-Arab entente, Riḍā speculated that the CUP was actually helping the Zionists in Palestine. There were therefore two options open to the Arabs: either to conclude an agreement with the Zionist leaders or to oppose Zionists in every way, first by forming competing societies and companies, and finally by taking up arms and forming armed gangs against them.[35] The objective of his advocacy for a Zionist-Arab entente was not only to work towards Arab independence from Ottoman rule, but

it was also meant to frustrate the "plots" of certain Arab Christians who, he thought, wanted the Great Powers to occupy the Arab provinces.[36] In the beginning of the summer of 1914, Riḍā withdrew his support for such an entente; and now he accused the Zionists of seeking a Jewish state that would stretch from Palestine to Iraq.[37]

The Ottomans in a "European" War

After the outbreak of the war, Riḍā thought that there were other reasons for the Great War than the political official version released by European states and Russia regarding its causes. The primary reason was the European and Russian fervour and competition in attaining world dominance. Russia aimed at increasing its international supremacy by annexing the Slavic peoples in the Balkans and Austria, whereas Germany hoped to impose its supreme authority not only on Europe but worldwide. Therefore, Germany organized its land and sea forces in such advanced ways according to natural sciences and military techniques. Britain's competition with the Germans in building navies was due to Britain's keen desire to preserve a supreme sea power in its colonies. On the other hand, France extended its colonies at the cost of weakening Muslim North Africa and its treasures by agitating for internal conflict and wars. The French were shrewd enough to increase the deployment of foreign troops to defend France in lieu of exposing their youth to die during the war.[38]

For Riḍā, such great nations in terms of science, industry, wealth and civilization were determined to spend hundreds of millions of what they had "sucked" from the wealth of the colonized peoples. European powers were going to "shed the blood and destroy the civilization [of those people …] simply for the sake of their greed, and love for supremacy on earth despite their camouflage of consolidating peace by means of war …"[39]

At that time, Riḍā was impressed by German power. He belittled the European anti-German propaganda that blamed the German Emperor Wilhelm II (1859–1941) for "flooding" Europe in a "sea of blood."[40] But he was not outspoken in supporting the idea of the Ottoman participation in that war, unlike some other religious scholars of his age. As he expected that the war was going to continue for years, the Sublime Porte was too poorly equipped to fight against such great powers.[41] Disastrous as the war was, Riḍā bemoaned that the most civilized nations were amassing their powers and recruiting other neutral nations to fight on either side only for the sake of retaliation against each other. In Riḍā's words,

nobody would be safe from this war. Everybody should be troubled about its nature and the evil that would destroy thousands of one's "human brethren." How great would be the loss to the world every hour in terms of scientists, philosophers, artisans and farmers leaving helpless widows and children behind![42]

In Riḍā's mind, all European nations were well equipped to launch war. Their military advance was based on competition in inventing weapons, but Germany was the best prepared for war. As it was primarily a war of competition, on the Triple Entente side the French were the "most intelligent and courageous", while the Britons were known for their "sagacity" and "wisdom" in their politics; and for their "justice" in their colonies. This is why these two countries were capable of stretching their colonial power over many nations. The sense of comptetion on the German side, on the other hand, was based on the refining of their skills in science, military, work, industry and commerce; and consequently on increasing their national treasures. Other states indulged in the war merely as subordinates to these nations. For Riḍā, among all these nations the Ottoman empire played second fiddle in the war, as the Porte did not have the mentality to challenge or compete with European powers in terms of military power, science and technology, except for the superficial Ottoman imitation of the western external modes of life.[43]

In the first months of the war, the British declared a Protectorate over Egypt by deposing Khedive Abbās Ḥilmī II (1874–1944) and nominating his nephew Ḥusayn Kāmil (1853–1917) as the Sultan of Egypt. Riḍā neither enthusiastically received the news, nor publicly opposed it. It sufficed for him to describe it as a direct consequence of the Ottoman declaration of war.[44]

Due to its dissatisfaction with the French contacts with Syrian Christian activists, the British administration in Egypt tried to exploit that party as an opposition movement in the Arab territories during the war. The anti-Ottoman attitude of Syrian intellectuals in Egypt and their demand for Arab unity suited the British interests in the Ottoman empire. Because of their aspirations for Arab unity and Riḍā's dream of establishing an Arab caliphate, Riḍā and other members of the party agreed to negotiate cooperation with the British authorities.[45] Their agreement included written conditions that had to be conveyed to the British government. If it was accepted by the government in London, it should be officially reported by Reuter's News Agency. In return, Arab societies would commit themselves to inciting revolts in the Arab provinces. Riḍā's party was given 1,000 Egyptian pounds to finance sending emissaries into the empire. Among their tasks were to report

that the British were prepared to supply arms and ammunition for the revolts and to appeal to Arab soldiers to desert from the Ottoman army.[46]

Riḍā expected Britain or Germany to have the most decisive influence during the war. The British were known for their patience and ability to multiply the number of their professional military staff. Although they did not have obligatory military service, the British were deploying workers which consequently interrupted their national production. However, if the Germans were going to win the war, he anticipated, Germany would not hesitate to impose its authority on Europe and unseat other European powers in the hearts of their colonies.[47] However, for him, the worst result of the war was that Europeans had already started to exert more efforts to increase their military powers and arms, and to amplify their ability and readiness to launch more wars in the future.[48]

Riḍā's perceptions of the war were based on his reading of the news available to him in the Arabic press.[49] Like many of his peers, he was keen to follow the news about the war fronts in Europe and the Middle East.[50] However, he was sceptical of the coverage of the war in the press. Telegrams, political, scientific and historical newspapers were filled with lies, paradoxes, abuses, misrepresentations and camouflage. Even official reports were censored and had to be mistrusted.[51]

In his analysis of the progress of the war, Riḍā's anti-colonial tone was evident, and he was hoping for a solution to the Eastern Question after the war. Almost nine months after its start, Riḍā argued that as love for authority is intrinsic for the human being, no nation would succumb to the power of others, despite the fact that the human structure could only be established on the independence of all nations and races. Monopoly of power and rule by the victorious side in this war would also be short-lived. Riḍā anticipated that, if there had been no firm guarantee for fulfilling general justice or equality for all nations and races, the Great War would undoubtedly have been the most unfortunate war for humanity. The to-be-defeated nations would not give up. They would persist in lobbying and creating new fronts that would definitely lead to a similar or even more "evil war" in the future.[52]

During the war, German and Ottoman workers continued their work on the Berlin-Baghdad Railway for military purposes. Although Riḍā considered this Ottoman-German railway project as one of greatest good deeds of Sultan Abdulhamīd II, he strongly criticized the Sultan's agreement to give the Germans ownership rights to the strip of land that extended alongside the railway in the heart of the Ottoman empire. Riḍā predicted that this railway, which was primarily established for the protection of the Ottoman empire, would one day endanger its existence. This railway that was supposed to be the "heart" of the empire was given

to foreigners: "how can anybody live while his heart is in the hands of others?!"[53] It was a great opportunity for Germany to manipulate and consolidate her existence within the empire in the long run. Riḍā did not entirely trust the Germans. By way of analogy for the German tactics in the war, he wrote that some Germans owned pieces of land in France and Belgium which they had actually used as trenches, basements and arms caches during the war. It was also reported that a German had prepared a football ground beside an important Belgian military base in Belgium, which had been found to conceal an underground store for heavy German canons once war broke out. Therefore, all German political and military promises to the empire in return for such privileges had to be suspected. It was better for the empire to keep its territories intact from any foreign rule than to expand its annexation of other regions.[54]

Riḍā was convinced that Germany would never give the Ottoman empire its full independence in the event of victory. Therefore, the Ottomans were urged neither to put their army and navy in German hands, nor to make the German language obligatory in the secondary educational system. It was a fatal mistake that the Sublime Porte had made it possible for the Germans to act in all the empire's financial, military, scientific and technical matters. Besides, it had enabled the Germans to own thousands of miles of railway track which crossed important metal mining areas.[55] Riḍā again harshly attacked the leaders of the CUP for their unbelief and their aim of undermining the construction of the *umma* in order to "establish another building, 'ornamented' by the Jews and 'designed' by the Germans."[56]

For Riḍā, even such Ottoman-German collaboration in the war would never result in any integration between the two races, as the Turks, due to their nationalist keenness in preserving their language, would always resist their assimilation into the German race or any other nation.[57] For Riḍā, the aim of the CUP leaders was merely to revive a "Turkish" *aṣabiyya* (group solidarity based upon kinship) above Islam by means of their Turcification of military education and the army.[58]

The First World War: Un-Islamic War

At the beginning of the war Riḍā did not frankly abandon his loyalty to the Ottoman empire, but was still confining his criticism to the CUP. However, he was anxious about the politically bad ramifications for non-Muslim minorities in the empire after the abolition of the Capitulations during the war and the propaganda of the Jihad declaration. The Jihad

propaganda incited Muslims to kill British, French or Russian "infidels," which endangered unarmed Europeans. Mobs and attack incidents were also reported in the press.[59]

As has been mentioned, Riḍā did not take any direct part in the Jihad ideologization campaigns during the war, but held antipathetic attitudes to the Ottoman Turkification policy and distrust of the Arabs. At this time, Riḍā reassured Syrian Christian minorities in his homeland that Islam would preserve their rights despite the Ottoman decision to enter the war.[60] In the Egyptian daily *Al-Ahram*, he asked Muslims in Syria not to be deluded by any religious justification provoking them to attack their non-Muslim compatriots. For him, all these calls to fight non-Muslims under the motto of "pan-Islam" were baseless and corrupting to the Koran and its verses. Referring to the Ottoman political leaders without mentioning the CUP explicitly, Riḍā argued that the proponents of the war, who depicted it as pan-Islamic by quoting from the Koran were paradoxically those who were actually ignorant of the Islamic faith and neglecting their religious duties. Their major objective was merely power and authority, not religion by any means. For Riḍā, it was an excuse to attack Syrian Christians if they became inclined towards western Christians or acquired any feeling of animosity to Muslims and the Sublime Porte, since neither love nor hate was a solid criterion for punishing anybody from an Islamic point of view. Muslims and Christians were therefore requested to demonstrate their loyality to the state and to cooperate for the sake of its industrial, economic and social welfare in conformity with the sharia.[61]

Unlike many Muslim religious supporters of the German-Ottoman Jihad declaration, Riḍā deemed the Ottoman participation in the Great War as being against the Islamic percepts of war. Therefore, he was eager to search for examples in Muslim history indicating the difference between the Islamic precepts of war and the nature of the Great War of Europe. In his view, this war, which Europeans propagated as "civilizational", was nothing but a clear-cut indication of the "beastly" and "illusive" materialist character of European civilization in contrast to their assertion of loving truth, values, peace and justice.[62]

In Riḍā's metaphoric words, the world of civilization resembled "an idolatry temple" where a statue of military power was erected: putting one foot on the truth, while the other rested on values; raising with the right hand the banner of dominance and authority and with the left the banner of desire and lust. People were divided between these two poles: "those prostrating or kneeling to the statue, and those burning incense or providing offerings [to the idols]."[63] Instead of changing science into a source of human happiness, justice and mercy, the "civilized"

world of Europe made it a source of cruelty, injustice and misery. As for Germany, it had exploited its wide knowledge and mastery of arts to invent "instruments of destruction" and "death." Riḍā was shocked by the news about Germany's unbelievably destructive canons and submarines, and the toxic gas producing green smoke that was fatal to human beings. Riḍā interpreted these new inventions in the light of the Koranic verse: "[t]hen watch for the Day when the sky will bring a visible smoke; covering the people; this is a painful torment" (Q. 44: 10–11).[64]

Riḍā contrasted the behaviour of the European powers in the Great War with what he saw as the "Islamic merciful ethics" of Arab conquests, which Islam had primarily stipulated to minimize war disasters.[65] He bemoaned that nations and states of his time, including Muslims, were deceived by what they perceived in that war as "values" of sciences and techniques for "human civilization". Giving several examples from Muslim normative sources, Riḍā emphatically contrasted this war with those wars launched by the Companions of the Prophet in early Islam, who were, in his view, known for their "mercy," "compassion" and "justice." In comparison, he asserted for instance that Muslims did not impose heavy taxes on the people of conquered regions, except the "small" amount of *jizya* (taxes) on non-Muslims levied in return for Muslims defending them. On the contrary, one of the ramifications of this war of the so-called "European civilization" was that European colonial powers imposed huge amounts of fines and taxes on their colonies and on other European opponents during the war in order to multiply their wealth and authority. As an example, Riḍā gave Belgium which became subject to heavy war taxes and fines after the German invasion.[66] If the Belgians had one day invaded Germany, Riḍā added, they would also have enforced upon it "shame" and "humiliation", the way they had behaved in their colony in the Congo.[67]

Riḍā dismissed any religious or sectarian connection with the Great War as was claimed by some. It was a "war of nations," but not a war among religions. Warring European nations spared no effort to justify and convince their peoples of the need for the war. Apart from a few philosophers, women, socialists and clergymen who defended Christianity as a religion of peace, the majority of Europeans supported the idea of war. Riḍā argued that there was no European nation that was going to launch this war against the will of the majority opinion in its country, except Russia where people had no majority opinion.[68]

The Great War was in Riḍā's view an entirely "greedy" materialistic war which had nothing to do with religion. It was even contrary to the "peaceful" message of Jesus. If the spirit of Christianity had been subjected to the authority of materialism in Europe, this war would never

have happened. Riḍā's stripping the war of any religious meaning was a message against the Ottoman officers and their decision to join Germany in the war on an Islamic religious basis. Riḍā did not trust the news that was spread regarding the fact that theOttoman decision to enter the war was primarily the result of Enver's support for it and his influential role in the CUP, since the majority of Ottoman decision-makers in his view were strongly in favour of the war. Therefore, it was a war launched by the state, but run by the CUP. Even if the Chamber of Deputies (or *Meclis-ı Mebusân*) had agreed to it, it was not a war of the Ottomans, since it did not represent the majority of people in the empire.[69] In sum, these Ottoman policy-makers were, for Riḍā, as materialistic as their European military and political counterparts.[70]

The Arab Question

It is obvious that Riḍā's religious and political views of the Great War were formulated on the basis of his engagement in the Arab Question. His eagerness to replace the Ottoman Caliphate with an Arab one after the war pushed him in the direction of negotiating with the British authorities in Egypt about his readiness to mediate between Britain and Arab rulers when the war spread in the Middle East. During the first years of the war, he continued his efforts to persuade British Intelligence in Cairo of his ability through the Decentralization Party to influence Arab officers in the Ottoman army to rebel against their Ottoman and German commanders.[71]

Riḍā's outspoken anti-CUP stance before and during the war caused him trouble. As early as 1914, the Ottoman authorities established an intelligence bureau that was committed to keeping track of Arab anti-Ottoman activists. In about a year, it received more than 4,000 reports and files of suspects that contained almost 9,000 dossiers.[72] After the outbreak of war, the wave of arrests and executions reached a high level. Riḍā, among others, was sentenced to death by a military court in ʿAleyh in absentia. He and other convicts were ordered to appear before the court within ten days, "otherwise they would be declared criminals whose civil rights would be annulled and whose property had to be confiscated."[73]

After the outbreak of the war, Riḍā's political choice quickly became evident when he became convinced that Great Britain was going to support the Arabs and Muslims in their independence if the Allies won the war. He felt that British officials in Egypt and the Sudan were initially in favour of an Arab caliphate.[74] In Riḍā's nostalgic imagination,

Mekka should be the seat of this Arab Quraishite caliphate as its religious centre, whereas Damascus should be the seat of a president and a secular government.[75]

In a meeting with Ronald Storrs, the Oriental Secretary at the British residency in Cairo, and Gilbert Clayton, Sudan Agent and Director of Intelligence for the Egyptian Army, Riḍā was given assurances that "in the event of Turkey joining the enemies of England in this war, England would not associate the Arabs with the Turks and would consider them as friends and not as enemies."[76] These promises gave Riḍā "pleasure" and "satisfaction". Therefore, he believed in Britain as the only alternative power that would help the Arabs "in every possible way and would defend them from any aggression."[77]

Such promises from the British authorities in Cairo were never formalized. If the Arabs drove the Turks and the Germans out after the war, Riḍā's proposal of Arab independence included Arabia, Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia, the countries lying between the Red Sea, Bahr El-Arab, the Persian Gulf, the frontiers of Persia and Anatolia and the Mediterranean Sea.[78] To the British authorities he fervently stressed the religious significance of the Arab Peninsula and the Arab eligibility for "the Caliphate which is the highest Islamic post."[79]

Believing in such promises, Riḍā regularly stressed that Britain was preferable for many Muslims to Russia, Germany and France for her justice and the religious freedom given to her subjects in the colonies. But his British-Arab friendship should not connote full British authority or protection over them, especially the Holy Shrines of Islam in the Arabian Peninsula.[80] An Arab Caliphate dependent on British authority was not acceptable to Riḍā, as the majority of Muslims were expected to refuse "an Arab puppet caliphate in the Arab Peninsula."[81] If the British were going to support the Arabs in their causes, they would "gain the friendship and loyalty of more than one hundred million of her Mohammedan subjects, because they would then be confident that the precepts of the Koran and the sanctity of the holy places will not be interfered with."[82]

In a conversation with Sir Mark Sykes, Riḍā was unshakable in his demand for full Arab independence with no partition or annexation by any foreign power. He confirmed to Sykes that the Arabs "were more intelligent than Turks and that they could easily manage their own affairs."[83] Even so the British were probably not taking Riḍā seriously. British authorities in Egypt were moreover thinking of the idea of sending Riḍā into exile in Malta during the war.[84] Mark Sykes wrote about him a few months after their meeting in Cairo:

> A leader of Pan-Arab and Pan-Islamic thought. In conversation he talks much as he writes. He is a hard uncompromising fanatical Moslem, the mainspring of whose ideas is the desire to eliminate Christian influence and to make Islam a political power, in as wide a field as possible. He said that the fall of Constantinople would mean the end of Turkish military power, and therefore it was necessary to set up another Mohammedan state to maintain Mohammedan prestige. I asked him if the action of the Sultan in accepting the dictation of the German Emperor was in consonance with the independence of the Caliph, whether such people as Enver, Talaat, Javid, and Carasso could be considered as Moslems, whether the Committee of Union and Progress had not slaughtered Khojas and Ulema without mercy, whether the whole policy of the young Turks had not been originally anti-religious in the widest sense. To this he replied that in the eyes of Islam, Turkey represented Mohammedan independence, and that the actions of individuals had no influence on this view, and that when he had criticized the actions of the Committee, he had been subject to attack and loss of prestige … I understand that Shaykh Reshid Riḍā has no great personal following but that his ideas coincide with those of a considerable number of the Arab Ulema. It will be seen that it is quite impossible to come to any understanding with people who hold such views, and it may be suggested that against such a party force is the only argument that they can understand.[85]

During the war in 1916, Riḍā discovered the bitter fact that that the British authorities were not willing to provide the Arabs with any support. Therefore, he turned to Sharif Ḥusayn of Mekka, but still confirmed his allegiance to the Ottoman Caliphate, which he distinguished from the CUP government.[86] He thought that supporting the Arab Revolt would therefore lead to the independence of the Hijaz, which was a "precautionary measure meant to save this holy territory from the control of the Allied powers."[87] Due to this changing course, Riḍā became suspected by the French and British intelligence services in Cairo. At this time, he was satisfied with the manner in which Sharif Ḥusayn handled the question of Hijaz independence. He even congratulated him on his recognition by the Allied powers as "the King of the Hijaz," wishing him to become "the King of the Arabs." Soon Riḍā regretted his earlier enthusiasm about Sharif Ḥusayn when he knew about the latter's secret agreements with the British about the independence of Syria and Iraq after the war.[88]

A Look forward: War Aftermath

In response to the entry of the US into the war on the side of the Allies and President Wilson's call to end all wars in 1917, Riḍā hoped that the war would end with full liberation for all "weak" nations.[89] However, he lamented the calamities of the war and the loss of tens of thousands of productive human beings in the fields of industry, agriculture and trade. For Riḍā, through its Imperial Navy Germany became the "inventor of vices of destruction and murder" in the world. Carrying naval guns on their ships, the Germans were not inhibited from killing humans and destroying goods and products on armed or unarmed ships, just to cause Britain and the Allies to lose their naval power.[90]

Riḍā's expectation of British victory in the war against the Germans came true. For him, the British were known for their "political cunning" and ability to fuel the enmity of other western states against Germany. In a conversation with an unnamed German orientalist, Riḍā agreed that although Germany overpowered England in sciences, arts and works, it lacked politics. In another conversation with some friends in Cairo during the war, it was said that Germany was going to have to cooperate with Russia if they wanted to get the Britons out of Egypt and India. Riḍā rejected this as impossible simply because Britain was cleverer than Germany in "striking" nations with each other, just like "the waterfall striking a rock with another."[91]

After Germany's initial phase of power and supremacy in world order, the German defeat caused its disastrous fate. For Riḍā, the end of the war was a result of a political game between "learned and wise" and "ignorant and fool" counterparts in conflict. Due to their political manoeuvering, the British were able to convince the Americans to come and rescue them and the Allies from the possible military "hell" that was supposed to be caused by Germany. In his words:

> England used two 'amulets' in order to get the American 'serpent' out of its hole … First of all, its call to rescue the freedom of nations and peoples from German supremacy that threatened to enslave the world. Secondly, the cunning of the Jews and their financial authority in that country, after England had promised them to return the Kingdom of Israel [and] the Holy Land as a reward … in spite of [of the rights of] the original possessors of the land, the Arabs: either Christians or Muslims.[92]

At this "Wilsonian moment,"[93] Riḍā found that Wilson's "stunning speeches" added significant moral support to the military and financial

power unleashed by the Allies against the Germans. By stipulating such an "attractive" programme for peace, Wilson's words had a magic effect on German socialists and workers, especially his point regarding the freedom of sea in war and peace. German socialist leaders threatened their government into yielding to Wilson's peace conditions; otherwise they would push German workers to go on strike.[94] Riḍā considered the end of the war a victory for the Americans on the surface, but the real winner was Britain. Moreover, Germany lost the war merely because of its "arrogance" and "despising" of the Americans.[95]

As a Muslim religious scholar, Riḍā tried to analyse the world political order in religious terms. By referring to the Koranic verses (Q. 7:128, 20:132, 28:83) indicating that "the [best] outcome will be for *al-mutaqqūn* (the righteous/pious)", some Muslims wondered how the British people were victorious in this war when they were not "righteous" in the Muslim religious sense. Riḍā disagreed with the views in the classical Muslim Koranic exegesis confining the meaning of such verses to obedience to God and fulfilling religious duties. He considered this interpretation as "narrow-mindedness" and "misunderstanding" of the contents of the verses, as the term *taqwa* (piety) has various meanings in the Koran depending on the change of context. Muslim exegetes lacked the knowledge that could enable them to deduce such sociological and political issues from the Koran and Sunna. As the word *taqwa* literally means "protect", Riḍā notes that the German people might have exceeded the English in their "military *taqwa*" for securing their military power. But the German politicians failed to protect themselves against internal conflicts with German socialists on the one hand, and were not clever enough to escape international discontent with their politics and collaboration with the Turks against the Arabs. The British, on the other hand, were more skilled in their political and diplomatic "*taqwa*," because they were able to strengthen their political ties with many world leaders, including Arabs.[96]

Germany's economic, scientific and military progress was therefore not enough to win the war. The British politically skilled "deviousness" was able to vanquish the German colonial ambitions. Many years after the war in the context of his discussions about the causes of the Palestinian riots (also known as the Western Wall Uprising) in 1929, Riḍā again made it clear that the British were much cleverer than any other nation in propaganda that was able to twist political realities. He lamented that the Arabs in their policy against the Jewish settlement in Palestine did not take any lessons from World War I. For him, all Europeans denigrated and disparaged the oriental peoples. In their international relations the Britons, just like all Europeans, had respected the rights and

promises of powerful nations only. Riḍā concluded that World War I was a propaganda war. The Anglo-French propaganda disseminated that the German state was "a military state with a cruel heart, rude, and lavish in greed, bloodshed, looting of money … and enslaving humans."[97] The British propaganda portrayed their fight as self-defence and defence of other "brothers in humanity." The power of this propaganda had provoked the American policy and German socialists and workers that finally obliged Germany to yield and sign a compromise. Riḍā was convinced that the Britons were the most "cunning" in breaching their treaties by twisting their contents according to their own perspectives, as Bismarck had once argued.[98]

Riḍā died in 1935 and he only witnessed the first two years of the Nazi regime. In his eyes, the Nazi ideology was born out of the political aftermath of World War I. It was a logical result of the political competition among European states to gain power. In his later years, Riḍā proposed Islam as a solution for the civilizational problems and political conflicts of Europe and the United States. He argued that since World War I, Europeans had organized many congresses, but their state of affairs was like "a mill donkey which goes around while languishing in one place."[99] As "might makes right," Riḍā insisted that powerful European states did not value any rights of weak nations in politics. For him, the Treaty of Versailles had been primarily entered into in order to weaken Germany. Its restrictive terms were the reason Nazi Germany tried to undermine the treaty by rebuilding its armed forces against the will of Europe. Out of fear of Nazi power, some of the Allies started to negotiate the conditions of another new treaty with Germany. Riḍā was of the view that the Allies had treated Germany unfairly and arrogantly despite their acknowledgment of its superiority in sciences, industry and systems. Hitler's rise in Germany was a new stage in European politics. In Riḍā's words, "[Germany's] *mujaddid* (renewing) leader uttered a shout of violation at this treaty and is rebuilding air and naval forces of the army. This had terrified them [the Allies], just as the roaring of a lion that scares a sheep." *Al-Manār* believed that European leaders had now reconsidered their positions because they knew perfectly well that any decisions about peace or war were in Hitler's "hands;" and any destruction or construction of Europe could be uttered from between his "lips". Therefore, the Allies were keenly listening to Hitler's annual speeches, which regularly gave warnings to his opponents. But despite this political change in Europe, Islam remained in Riḍā's perspective the only solution for the corruption of all these western states and nations. Therefore, Muslims should stand shoulder to shoulder with one another in propagating their religion in Europe.[100]

Conclusion

Riḍā's engagement with World War I was part of his general image of Europe and world politics. In general, he was influenced by the increasing flow of information and images in the press across the Muslim world on the one hand, and by his pragmatic political choices on the other. As a famous Muslim writer with a global readership across the Muslim world of his time, his representations certainly played a role in the popularization of European thought in the Muslim mind.

Remarkably enough, Riḍā did not involve himself in the Jihad debate and remained silent about the religious meaning of the Ottoman fatwa during World War I. As a pan-Arabist Riḍā was much engaged in underlining its political causes and the consequences of the war in the region. Throughout the war years, he was convinced that either Germany or Great Britain was going to rule the world order after winning the war. He argued that materialist ideas among Europeans would push Europe to a wholesale and dreadful war after which the strongest state would rule the world.[101] Due to his dreams of establishing an Arab caliphate, he was not really enthusiastic about the Ottoman coalition with Germany. He rode the wave of Arab nationalism in that stage of his career. The CUP alliance with Germany brought a radical imbalance to the world order, which deprived the Arabs and Muslims of the chance to obtain their rights.

Although Riḍā regularly praised Germany's militarism against the Allies, he knew perfectly well that that country had its ambitions in the Muslim world as well. In his quest for new pragmatic solutions to the decline of Islam in the religious and political sense, Riḍā was ready to tread any possible political path in the pre-war and war period. But his ambitions to realize Arab unity reached deadlock when he lost his hope of finding any "beneficiary" coalition in his political dreams. He finally came to the bitter conclusion that all liberation and independence promises made by Europeans were merely lip service. For him, even German ultra-nationalists were anti-Arab by nature.[102]

Riḍā attempted to offer alternative civilizational discourses based on Islamic culture and tradition. In the end, his paradoxal view of Europe and his disenchantment reflected that of a whole generation of Muslims, who experienced the World War in the Middle East; his ideas were rearticulated and re-asserted by the following generation in relation to the European powers and their ideas in the new world order[103] in the years to come after World War I.

Notes

1 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/9 (August 1914), p. 667.
2 Mahmoud Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism in the Colonial Era: Re-reading Rashīd *Riḍā's* idea on the *Caliphate*", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117/2 (1997), p. 263.
3 See, for example, Götz Nordbruch, "The Arab World and National Socialism", available at: http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles///Files/Om_SDU/Centre/C_Mellemoest/Videncenter/Nyheder/2011/1103GN.pdf (last access 9 November 2014); cf. Götz Nordbruch, "'Cultural Fusion' of Thought and Ambitions? Memory, Politics and the History of Arab–Nazi German Encounters", *Middle Eastern Studies* 47:1 (2011), pp. 183–194.
4 Mustafa Aksakal, "'Holy War Made in Germany'? Ottoman Origins of the 1914 Jihad", *War in History* 18:2 (2011), pp. 184–199. See Wolfgang Schwanitz, "*Euro-Islam* by *'Jihad Made* in Germany'", in Nathalie Clayer and Eric Germain (eds.), *Islam in Inter-War Europe* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), pp. 271–286; Raouf Abbas Hamed, "Germany and the Egyptian Nationalist Movement 1882–1918", *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series, Bd. 28, Nr. 1:4 (1988), pp. 17–24; id., "The Role of Islam in German Propaganda in the Arab East during the First World War: War: Aims, Means, Results and Local Reactions", in O. Farschid, M. Kropp and S. Dähne (eds.), *The First World War as Remembered in the Countries of the Eastern Mediterranean* (Beirut: Orient-Institut, 2006), pp. 391–414.
5 Abdel-Raouf Sinno, "The Role of Islam in German Propaganda in the Arab East during the First World War: War: Aims, Means, Results and Local Reactions", in O. Farschid, M. Kropp and S. Dähne (eds.), *The First World War as Remembered in the Countries of the Eastern Mediterranean* (Beirut: Orient-Institut, 2006), pp. 391–414.
6 *Haddad*, "Arab Religious Nationalism," 257.
7 E. Tauber, *The Arab Movements in World War I* (London: Frank Cass, 1993), p. 164. The founder of the Egyptian Nationalist Party, Mustafā Kāmil, was the first to coin this term. About him see Fritz Steppat, "Nationalismus und Islam bei Mustafā Kamil. Ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte der ägyptischen Nationalbewegung", *Die Welt des Islams* 4/4 (1956), pp. 241–341.
8 Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 256.
9 *Al-Manār*, vol. 1/19 (August 1898), pp. 356–359.
10 As quoted in Sean McMeekin, *The Berlin-Baghdad Express: The Ottoman Empire and Germany's Bid for World Power* (Harvard University Press, 2010), p. 14.
11 *Al-Manār*, vol. 1/36 (December 1898), pp. 711–715.
12 *Al-Manār*, vol. 6/24 (March 1904), pp. 946–953. See, for example, John W.M. Chapman, "Russia, Germanyand the Anglo-Japanese Intelligence Collaboration, 1896–1906", in Mark Erickson and Ljubica Erickson, *Russia War, Peace and Diplomacy* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2005). Cf. *Al-Manār*, vol. 8/7 (June 1905), pp. 279–281.
13 *Al-Manār*, vol. 7/18 (Nov. 1904), p. 719; *al-Manār*, vol. 8/5 (May 1905), p. 194.
14 As quoted in Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 257.
15 Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 257.

16 As quoted in Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 261.
17 Tauber, *The Arab Movements*, pp. 112–113.
18 Ibid., p. 3.
19 Ibid., pp. 3–5. See also Eyal Zisser, "Rashīd Riḍā: On the way to Syrian nationalism in the shade of Islam and Arabism", in Adel Bashara (ed.), *The Origins of Syrian Nationhood: Histories, Pioneers and Identity* (London; New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 123–140.
20 *Al-Manār*, vol. 14/5 (May 1911), pp. 382–386.
21 *Al-Manār*, vol. 14/10 (October 1911), p. 752.
22 *Al-Manār*, vol. 14/10 (October 1911), pp. 753–754.
23 *Al-Manār*, vol. 15/4 (April 1912), p. 303.
24 *Al-Manār*, vol. 15/11 (November, 1912), p. 838.
25 *Al-Manār*, vol. 16/2 (February 1913), p. 131.
26 See, Bruce C. Westrate, *Arab Bureau: British Policy in the Middle East, 1916–1920* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010).
27 See E. Tauber, "Rashīd Riḍā and Political Attitudes during World War I", *The Muslim World* 85:1–2 (1995), pp. 107–121. Cf. E. Tauber, "Three Approaches, One Idea: Religion and State in the Thought of ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Kawākibī, Najīb'Azūrī and Rashīd Riḍā", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 21:2 (1994), pp. 190–198; E. Tauber, "Rashīd Riḍā and Faysal's Kingdom in Syria", *The Muslim World* 85 (1995), pp. 235–245; E. Tauber, "Rashīd Riḍā as Pan-Arabist before the World War I", *The Muslim World* 79/2 (1989), pp. 102–112; E. Tauber, "The Political Life of Rashīd Riḍā", *Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 19–20 (1998), pp. 261–272.
28 Donald M. McKale, *War by Revolution: Germany and Great Britain in the Middle East in the Era of World War I* (Kent State University Press, 1998), pp. 42–43.
29 *Al-Manār*, vol. 16/8 (August, 1913), p. 625.
30 *Al-Manār*, vol. 16/8 (August, 1913), pp. 623–626. Cf., *al-Manār*, vol. 17/2 (January 1914), pp. 148–152.
31 Tauber, "The Political Life", p. 262.
32 Ibid., p. 263.
33 Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 263.
34 Neville Mandel, *The Arabs and Zionism before World War I* (University of California Press, 1976), pp. 153–154.
35 Mandel, *The Arabs and Zionism*, p. 189.
36 Ibid., p. 204.
37 Ibid., p. 213.
38 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/9 (August 1914), pp. 670–671.
39 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/9 (August 1914), pp. 670–672.
40 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/9 (August 1914), p. 671. See also *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/10 (Sept. 1914), pp. 798–800.
41 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/9 (August 1914), p. 720.
42 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/12 (Nov. 1914), pp. 950–955.
43 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/12 (Nov. 1914), pp. 953–954.
44 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/1 (Feb. 1915), pp. 53–61.
45 Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908–1918* (University of California Press, 1997).

46 Tauber, *The Arab Movements*, pp. 16–17.
47 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/12 (Nov. 1914), p. 953. See also, pp. 958–959.
48 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/2 (March, 1915), pp. 141–152. Here Riḍā quoted some of the works of the German military general and historian Friedrich von Bernhardi (1849–1930), who considered war as a "biological necessity" in accordance with natural causes. Riḍā entitled his article "The State and the Germans and the Two Opposing Directions resembling belief and unbelief." For more about the project see, for example, Friedrich von Bernhardi. *Deutschland und der nächste Krieg* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1912); *Vom heutigen Kriege*, vol. 1 *Grundlagen und Elemente des heutigen Krieges*, and vol. 2 *Kampf und Kriegführung* (Berlin: Mittler, 1912).
49 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/4 (May 1915), pp. 307–312. He used to brief his readers on the developments on the battlefield on all fronts. To deduce "good" news and "useful" opinions from newspapers was difficult for Riḍā. Magazines were more careful in selecting their news about the war.
50 See, *al-Manār*, vol. 17/12 (Nov. 1914), p. 955.
51 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/4 (May 1915), pp. 307–312.
52 Ibid., p. 312.
53 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/6 (July, 1915), pp. 472–473.
54 Ibid., p. 473.
55 *Al-Manār*, vol. 19/3 (Aug. 1916), pp. 153–160. In order to support his views, Riḍā quoted a conversation between King Edward VII (1841–1910) and Daisy Greville (1861–1938), Countess of Warwick, in which she asked the king about the reason for his hatred of his nephew Wihlem II. In his answer, King Edward completely denied any animosity towards Wihlem, but his anxiety about the German imperial inclination to occupy any region even if it were his country.
56 *Al-Manār*, vol. 19/3 (Aug. 1916), p. 165.
57 Ibid., p. 166.
58 *Al-Manār*, vol. 19/9 (Feb. 1917), pp. 555–562.
59 See McMeekin, *The Berlin-Baghdad Express*, pp. 123–136.
60 *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/12 (Nov. 1914), pp. 956–958.
61 Ibid., pp. 957–958. See also *Al-Manār*, vol. 17/11 (Oct. 1914), pp. 868–880.
62 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/3 (April, 1915), pp. 182–192. He sarcasticaly called it *al-Harb al-Madaniyya al-ʿUzma* (the Great Civilizational War) or sometimes *Harb al-Madaniyya al-Urubiyya* (the War of European Civilization).
63 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/3 (April, 1915), p. 182.
64 Ibid., pp. 182–183.
65 Ibid., p. 183.
66 See Henri Pirenne, *Belgium and the First World War*, introduced by Sarah Keymeulen and forwarded by David Nicholas (The Brabant Press, 2014).
67 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/3 (April, 1915), p. 185.
68 *Al-Manār*, vol. 18/10 (Nov. 1915), pp. 746–752.
69 Ibid., pp. 750–752.
70 Ibid., p. 752.
71 Tauber, "Rashīd Riḍā".
72 Tauber, *The Arab Movements*, p. 37.
73 Ibid., p. 52.

74 Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 263.
75 Ibid., p. 268.
76 "Translation of a Memorandum by Rashid Rida", Wingate Papers 135/7/61; as quoted in Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 264.
77 Ibid., p. 264.
78 As quoted in Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 264.
79 Wingate Papers 101/17/3–5; as quoted in Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 266.
80 Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 267.
81 Ibid., p. 267.
82 Ibid., p. 265.
83 Briton Cooper Busch, *Britain, India, and the Arabs, 1914–1921* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1971), p. 62, as cited by Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 268.
84 Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 268.
85 "Policy in the Middle East II. Select Reports and Telegrams from Sir Mark Sykes. Report No. 14 (Secret)." From Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Mark Sykes, Bart., M.P., to the Director of Military Operations Shepherd Hotel, Cairo, 14 July 1915. London, India Office Records L, /P&S/10/5255, as quoted in Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 268.
86 Haddad, "Arab Religious Nationalism", p. 269.
87 Ibid., p. 269.
88 Ibid., p. 270; see *al-Manār*, 20/1 (July 1917), pp. 33–47.
89 *Al-Manār*, vol. 20/1 (July 1917), pp. 48–61.
90 *Al-Manār*, vol. 20/8 (May 1918), pp. 364–365.
91 *Al-Manār*, vol. 21/7 (April, 1920), p. 338.
92 Ibid., p. 339.
93 See Erez Manela, *The Wisonian moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford University Press, 2007).
94 *Al-Manār*, vol. 21/7 (April, 1920), p. 339. See John L. Snell, "Wilson's Peace Program *and* German Socialism, January–March 1918", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 38 (1951), pp. 187–214.
95 *Al-Manār*, vol. 21/7 (April, 1920), pp. 339–340. See also other post-war articles about peace, vol. 20/5 (January 1918), pp. 246–248; 20/10 (October 1918), pp. 444–446; 21/1 (December 1918), pp. 17–37; 21/3 (May 1919), pp. 138–150; 21/4 (June 1919), pp. 189–197; (October 1919), pp. 291–296; 21/6 (October 1919) pp. 297–304; 21/7 (April 1920), pp. 371–376.
96 *Al-Manār*, vol. 21/7 (April, 1920), pp. 341–344.
97 Ibid., p. 342.
98 Ibid., p. 343.
99 *Al-Manār*, vol. 35/1 (July 1935), pp. 33–40.
100 Ibid., pp. 33–40.
101 *Al-Manār*, vol. 21/7 (April, 1920), p. 344.
102 *Al-Manār*, vol. 30/6 (Dec. 1930), pp. 450–468.
103 Cemil Aydin, *The Politics of anti-westernism in Asia* (Colombia University Press, 2007), p. 11.